



ERIC GIBSON
INTERIM DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

September 18, 2008

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:

Garza 4-Lot Minor Subdivision/TPM 20777/ER 03-21-006
Bennett 4-Lot Minor Subdivision/TPM 20784/ER 03-21-009

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact: Michelle Conners, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-2636
c. E-mail: Michelle.Conners@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

TPM 20777: 1270 Shasta Way, Boulevard, CA 91905. San Diego County,
(APN 658-020-76)

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1319, Grid C/9

TPM 20784: 1268 Shasta Way, Boulevard, CA 91905. San Diego County,
(APN 658-020-75)

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1319, Grid C/9

5. Project Applicant name and address:

TPM 20777: Joe and Michelle Garza
1736 Geranium Street
Carlsbad, CA 92009

TPM 20784: Kimberly Bennett
3110 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 309
San Diego, CA 92106

6. General Plan Designation
Community Plan: Mountain Empire
Land Use Designation: (18) Multiple Rural Use
Density: 1 du/4, 8, 20 acre(s)
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: S92
Minimum Lot Size: 8 acre(s)
Special Area Regulation: --

8. Description of project:

The project is two Tentative Parcel Maps (TPMs) adjacent to each other in the Mountain Empire Community Planning Group, within unincorporated San Diego County. Garza TPM 20777 is located at 1270 Shasta Way and Bennett TPM 20784 is located at 1268 Shasta Way. Both TPMs are subject to the General Plan Regional Category RDA (Rural Development Area), Land Use Designation (18) Multiple Rural Use with density of 1 dwelling unit per 4, 8, or 20 acres. Zoning for both sites is S92.

Garza TPM 20777 proposes to subdivide a 49.5 (net) acre parcel into four (4) lots and one (1) remainder lot. The proposed lots range in size from 8.00 to 17.31 acres (Table 1). Proposed Parcel 1 contains an existing single-family residence that would be retained. Proposed Parcels 2, 3, 4 and the Remainder Parcel are currently vacant. The vacant parcels have the potential each to support a future 3 bedroom single-family residence.

Bennett TPM 20784 proposes to subdivide a 47.46 (net) acre parcel into four (4) lots and one (1) remainder lot. The proposed lots range in size from 8.00 to 13.75 acres (Table 1). Proposed Parcel 1 contains an existing single-family residence that would be retained. Proposed Parcel 2, 3, 4 and the Remainder Parcel are currently vacant. The vacant parcels have the potential each to support a future 3 bedroom single-family residence.

Table 1: Proposed lot sizes for Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784

Parcel Name	Garza TPM 20777 Lot Size		Bennett TPM 20784 Lot Size	
	Net Acres	Gross Acres	Net Acres	Gross Acres
Proposed Parcel 1	8.19	9.29	8.52	9.24
Proposed Parcel 2	8.00	8.48	8.68	8.95
Proposed Parcel 3	8.00	8.48	8.51	8.77
Proposed Parcel 4	8.00	8.51	13.75	14.22
Proposed Remainder Parcel	17.31	18.56	8.00	8.56
Total	49.50	53.32	47.46	49.74

Access to each site would be provided by a shared, proposed private road, unnamed "Street A," that would run in a north-south direction and connect to Shasta Way. "Street A" would be improved to a width of 24 feet with 6 inches of disintegrated granite. In addition, a second proposed private road, unnamed "Street B" would run in an east-west direction and intersect with "Street A". "Street B" would run along the shared boundary line between the two adjacent TPMs and end in a 36 foot cul de sac. "Street B" would also be composed of 6 inches disintegrated granite. Both proposed roads would be designed in conformance with emergency access standards.

Proposed grading for Garza TPM 20777 would consist of the balanced cut and fill of 1,500 cubic yards of material. Proposed grading for Bennett TPM 20784 would consist of the balanced cut and fill of 2,000 cubic yards of material.

Public services for both TPMs would be provided by the Boulevard Volunteer Fire Department and the Mountain Empire Unified School District. An elementary school is located within 3.5 miles of the proposed project sites. Junior and high schools are located 18 miles away. The Boulevard Volunteer Fire Station is located four miles away (representing a 15 minute emergency response time) for the proposed sites. Water would be provided by individual wells on each of the proposed lots. Wastewater service would be provided by individual septic systems on each of the proposed lots.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

Lands surrounding the project site include undeveloped land to the east and rural, large lot residential development with substantial mature native vegetation to the north, west, and south. The topography of the project sites and adjacent land ranges from 3,620 feet above mean sea level (MSL) to 3,860 above MSL. The average slope is less than 25% grade. An unnamed blue line stream passes through the eastern side of both parcels from south to north. The site is located approximately one mile south of Highway 94 and ¼ mile east of the Campo Indian Reservation.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Tentative Parcel Map	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Groundwater Wells and Exploratory or Test Borings Permit	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Water Well Permit	County of San Diego
General Construction Storm water Permit	RWQCB
School District Approval	Mountain Empire Unified School District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Michelle Conners

Printed Name

Date

Land Use/Environmental Planner

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

No Impact: The two TPMs ("the proposed project"), located adjacent to one another in Boulevard, are approximately one mile south of SR 94 and not visible from the highway. Based on a site visit by County staff on August 23, 2004 the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and would not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and would not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project site is visible by surrounding neighbors and is largely obscured by terrain and vegetation. Therefore, the project would not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic. Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

No Impact: Based on a site visit completed by County staff on August 23, 2004 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and would not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The proposed project site is located approximately one mile south of SR 94 and is not visible from the highway. Furthermore, the proposed project would not remove visual resources as all existing uses on both proposed TPMs would remain onsite. Potential future residential development on the site would be visually consistent with the area as there are rural residential uses located to the north, west, and south of the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding area can be characterized as rural residential parcels ranging in size from 2.68 acres to over 100 acres. Lots to the north, west and south of the project sites are developed with residential dwelling units and accessory buildings. Many vacant and developed lots exhibit substantial mature native vegetation. The proposed project would divide a total of approximately 97 acres into 8 parcels and 2 remainder parcels ranging in size from 8.00 acres to 17.31 acres. The size of the proposed lots would be consistent with those in the surrounding area. Therefore, the visual impact resulting from an increase in density would be less than significant. The proposed project would likely result in the future development of a total of 8 single-family homes. As residential uses are located in the immediate vicinity to the north, west and south of the site, any future residential development resulting from the proposed project would be visually consistent with the surrounding area. Furthermore, grading associated with potential future development would not result in significant changes to existing topography, as grading would be confined to the development of the house pads and road improvements. Therefore, the existing visual quality of the site would not be substantially altered and potential direct impacts to the visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings would be less than significant.

Finally, the project would not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and would not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: (1) The project would comply with the anticipated residential use of the property as designed by both the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, (2) the current residential use and intended future residential use of the site is consistent with existing surrounding residential uses, and (3) the existing topography of the site would not require excessive grading that would significantly change the form of the landscape. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes two TPMs, which would result in the residential subdivision of a total of approximately 97 acres into 8 parcels and 2 remainder parcels. Future development on 8 of the proposed parcels may include outdoor lighting. Any future outdoor lighting pursuant to the project would be required to

meet the requirements of the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Section 6322-6326) and the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115). Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

The project would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project would conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Light Pollution Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources of light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code would ensure that the project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project and cumulative level.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site, defined as the parcel boundaries of the two proposed TPMs and offsite improvements, does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned S92, which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and surrounding area within a radius of ¼ mile does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations would be converted to a non-agricultural use as a result of the proposed project.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP.

Operation of the project would not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the project is consistent with the SANDAG growth projections used in the RAQS and SIP; therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes two TPMs each proposing the residential subdivision of 4 parcels and 1 remainder parcel that would involve grading for the potential future development of a total of 8 single-family homes. Grading is anticipated to include a balanced cut and fill of a combined 3,500 cubic yards. Grading operations associated with the potential future development would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from grading and construction would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, traffic generated by the project is anticipated to result in 96 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria

pollutants. As such, the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) under the CAAQS. Ozone is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, and dust from construction.

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would result in the establishment of 8 vacant parcels, which in the future may each be developed with a single-family residence. Air quality emissions associated with this potential future development include PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities as well as VOCs resulting from an increase of traffic. Grading operations associated with the construction of the future homes would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. In addition, emissions resulting from the use of construction equipment would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. Therefore, emissions resulting from construction and grading would be less than significant. Traffic associated with the proposed project is anticipated to be 96 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM₁₀. Therefore, emissions related to vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

Finally, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project, as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, or any O₃ precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

No Impact: Based a site visit conducted by County staff on August 23, 2004, sensitive receptors and point sources of toxic emissions have not been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. Furthermore, no point-source emissions of air pollutants (other than vehicle emissions) are associated with the project. As such, the project would not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: A Biological Resources Report dated July 2005 and prepared by Robin Church was completed for the project. In addition to evaluating the project and the cumulative impacts of the proposed project, the report also evaluated the potential impacts of a third proposed TPM, Powell 4-Lot Minor Subdivision TPM 20798, which is located adjacent to the proposed project to the south. Powell 4-Lot Minor Subdivision TPM 20798 will be evaluated independently in a separate CEQA Initial Study and will only be referenced here for the purpose of describing cumulative impacts.

The following discussion separately analyzes the direct impacts of Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784. A combined cumulative impacts analysis follows.

Garza TPM 20777

Direct Impact Analysis - Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit by County staff on November 6, 2003 and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2005 prepared by Robin Church, the 53.33 (gross) acre Garza TPM 20777 site supports native vegetation including: semi-desert chaparral (49.96 acres), red shank chaparral (1.66 acres) and southern coast live oak riparian forest (1.71 acres). The site also supports several sensitive plant species including southern jewelflower and desert beauty. Sensitive wildlife species observed onsite include: San Diego horned lizard, turkey vulture, San Diego black-tailed jack rabbit and San Diego desert woodrat. The mountain lion was not observed but has a high potential to occur onsite.

A focused survey for the Quino checkerspot butterfly conducted in April and May 2003 did not reveal the presence of this federally endangered species. Updated surveys were conducted onsite in 2007 with negative results. The Quino checkerspot butterfly (QCB) is not expected to occur on this site because the site lacks the primary host plant, dwarf plantain. The site does not support clay soils or well developed cryptogammic crusts. Vegetation onsite consists of primarily tall-statured chaparral species. Based on the surveys and the site conditions, the probability of QCB occurring on the Garza property is low.

Potential direct impacts resulting from the proposed TPM include 22.42 acres of semi-desert chaparral (including 0.6 acres of offsite impacts). To reduce impacts to chaparral habitat to a level below significant requires mitigation at a 1:1 ratio. Garza TPM 20777 would mitigate direct impacts to semi-desert chaparral through the establishment of an onsite 27.95 acre open space easement. The 27.95 acre onsite open space easement would include 24.81 acres of semi desert chaparral, which would exceed the 1:1 mitigation requirement for this habitat type by 2.39 acres. In addition, all of the red shank chaparral and southern coast live oak riparian forest (besides a small portion, 0.23 acres, considered impact neutral due to existing easements) would be incorporated into the onsite open space easement. Therefore, potential impacts to these habitat types would be avoided. Finally, all of the sensitive plant species would be preserved within the 27.95 acre open space easement and would not be impacted. Thus, the project would preserve the existing biological diversity onsite. The preservation of a mosaic of habitats would help to fulfill the life history of more species, including the sensitive species observed or with a high potential to occur, than would preservation of a monotypic habitat. The proposed 27.95 acre habitat preservation area is contiguous with native habitat offsite to the east and thus, sensitive wildlife species observed onsite should be able to continue to utilize the site and also move through the site towards the riparian area offsite to the east. The project would be conditioned to avoid disturbance during the general avian breeding season.

Bennett TPM 20784

Direct Impact Analysis - Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a site visit by a County staff biologist on November 6, 2003, and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2005 prepared by Robin Church, the 49.74 (gross) acre Bennett TPM 20784 site supports native vegetation including: semi-desert chaparral (36.28 acres), red shank chaparral (6.12 acres) and southern coast live oak riparian forest (4.79 acres). The site supports several sensitive plant species including desert beauty, sticky geraea, jacumba milkvetch and tecate tarplant. Sensitive wildlife species observed onsite include: San Diego horned lizard, Cooper's hawk, mountain lion, and the San Diego desert woodrat. San Diego black-tailed jack rabbit was not observed but was rated with a high potential to occur onsite.

A focused survey for the Quino checkerspot butterfly conducted in April and May 2003 did not reveal the presence of this federally endangered species. Updated surveys were conducted onsite in 2007 with negative results. The Quino checkerspot butterfly (QCB) is not expected to occur on this site because the site lacks the primary host plant, dwarf plantain. The site does not support clay soils or well developed cryptogammic crusts. Vegetation onsite consists of primarily tall-statured chaparral species. Based on the surveys and the site conditions, the probability of QCB occurring on the Bennett property is low.

Potential direct impacts resulting from the proposed Bennett TPM 20784 include 16.37 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 3.24 acres of red shank chaparral. To reduce these

impacts to a level below significant requires mitigation at a 1:1 ratio. Semi-desert chaparral and red shank chaparral are similar habitat types, comparable in biological function and value. Therefore, mitigation to offset impacts to one habitat type may include a mix of both habitat types. In the case of Bennett TPM 20784, direct impacts to semi-desert chaparral and red shank chaparral would be mitigated through the establishment of an onsite 26.59 acre open space easement. The proposed easement would include 19.17 acres of semi desert chaparral and 2.88 acres of red shank chaparral. The proposed open space easement would exceed the 1:1 mitigation requirement for combined impacts to chaparral habitat by 2.44 acres. Potential impacts to coast live oak riparian forest would be avoided, as all 4.54 acres of this habitat type would also be included in the 26.59 acre open space easement. Thus, the project would preserve the existing biological diversity through the proposed onsite open space easement. The preservation of a mosaic of habitats will help to fulfill the life history of more species, including the sensitive species observed or with a high potential to occur, than a monotypic habitat would. The habitat preserved is contiguous with native habitat offsite to the east and thus, sensitive wildlife species observed onsite should be able to continue to utilize the site and also move through the site towards the riparian area onsite and offsite to the east. The project would be conditioned to avoid disturbance during the general avian breeding season.

Impacts may occur to approximately 210 individuals of the desert beauty population onsite. This loss is not considered significant because 26.59 acres of onsite habitat would be purchased to contribute to the long term sustainability of the population. All of the other sensitive plant species would be protected within a proposed 26.59-acre onsite open space easement. The open space easement design would provide a minimum of a 30 foot buffer to the protected plant species.

Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784

Cumulative Impact Analysis - There are few other projects within the immediate vicinity of the Garza and Bennett properties. The Garza TPM would result in impacts to 22.42 acres of semi-desert chaparral. Mitigation requirements (a 1:1 ratio) would be exceeded by 27.95 acres of onsite habitat preservation in an open space easement. The Bennett TPM would most likely result in impacts to 16.37 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 3.24 acres of red shank chaparral. Mitigation requirements (a 1:1 ratio) would be exceeded by 26.59 acres of onsite habitat preservation in an open space easement. The eastern portion of the Garza onsite open space easement would be contiguous with the eastern portion of the Bennett onsite open space easement.

Powell TPM 20798, a potential future project, is located in the immediate vicinity to the south of the Garza site. This project would most likely result in impacts to 9.17 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 15.55 acres of red shank chaparral. Proposed mitigation includes 11.43 acres of habitat conserved onsite and 8.77 acres acquired offsite. Therefore, the total acres of chaparral impacted would be 24.72; the total acres of chaparral proposed to be mitigated would be 20.20. To meet the required 1:1 mitigation ratio, the project would have to acquire an additional 4.52 acres of chaparral. The Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784 projects intend to apply their excess open

space acreage to the Powell TPM 20798 project. The additional open space they would be able to contribute that would not be used as mitigation for their own direct impacts amounts to 4.83 acres of chaparral habitat. This amount meets that which the Powell TPM 20798 needs to acquire (4.52 acres) and exceeds it by 0.31 acres. Therefore, with the application of excess acreage from the Garza and Bennett projects, all three TPM projects would fully meet the mitigation requirements for habitat impacts. Finally, an additional 6.06 acres of Southern coast live oak riparian forest would also be placed in an RPO wetland and buffer open space easement (however, this acreage can not be counted towards overall mitigation).

Due to their adjacency and to better determine cumulative impacts to sensitive plant species, a combined biological analysis was completed for Bennett TPM 20784, Garza TPM 20777, and Powell TPM 20798. The desert beauty population which occurs on the three project sites totals approximately 2225 individuals. Presumably the population also extends to the other undeveloped lands within the project vicinity. The three projects would cumulatively impact 25% of the desert beauty population on the three sites. However, the population probably is not limited to the three project sites and the impacts likely represent a smaller impact to the population.

The Ralph project (TPM 20252) located approximately ½ mile to the north was approved in September 1999. This project preserved approximately 3.7 acres of woodland and chaparral (of the 48.1 acre site) within onsite open space. Potential cumulative impacts resulting from the three adjacent TPMs and the Ralph project would be fully mitigated and the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

The mitigation ratio for habitat loss applied to these projects is meant to compensate for the direct as well as cumulative loss of habitat. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above including onsite biological open space design and preservation, breeding season avoidance and mitigation ratios for this and other projects in the area, the proposal would not result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: A Biological Resources Report dated July 2005 and prepared by Robin Church was completed for the project.

In addition to evaluating the project and the cumulative impacts of the proposed project, the report also evaluated the potential impacts of a third proposed TPM, Powell 4-Lot Minor Subdivision TPM 20798, which is located adjacent to the proposed project to the south. Powell 4-Lot Minor Subdivision TPM 20798 will be evaluated independently in a separate CEQA Initial Study and will only be referenced here for the purpose of describing cumulative impacts.

The following discussion separately analyzes the direct impacts of Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784. A combined cumulative impacts analysis follows.

Garza TPM 20777

Direct Impact Analysis - Based on a site visit conducted by County staff biologist Megan Hamilton on November 6, 2003 and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2005 prepared by Robin Church, it has been determined that the proposed project site contains 1.71 acres of southern coast live oak riparian forest, 49.96 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 1.66 acres of red shank chaparral. A jurisdictional wetland (County, state and federal) traverses the very northeast corner of the project site boundary. The wetland and riparian forest would be completely protected within an open space easement. A 180 foot buffer is provided by the current design where existing improvements, the road and the well, do not preclude it. Fencing and signage of the proposed open space easement and a limited building zone easement would help to alleviate potential indirect impacts to the open space easement, including noise, lighting, human encroachment and invasive species.

Impacts to 22.42 acres of semi-desert and red shank chaparral, including 0.66 acres of offsite impacts, would be mitigated at a ratio of 1:1 through the preservation of 26.43 acres of semi- desert and red shank chaparral.

Bennett TPM 20784

Direct Impact Analysis - Based on a site visit conducted by County staff biologist Megan Hamilton on November 6, 2003 and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2005 prepared by Robin Church, it has been determined that the proposed project site contains 4.79 acres of southern coast live oak riparian forest, 36.28 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 6.12 acres of red shank chaparral. A jurisdictional wetland (County, state and federal) traverses the eastern side of the project site boundary. The wetland and riparian forest would be completely protected within a proposed open space easement. A 180-foot buffer is provided by the current design where existing improvements, the road and the well, do not preclude it. Fencing and signage of the proposed open space easement and a limited building zone easement would help to alleviate potential indirect impacts to the open space easement, including noise, lighting, human encroachment and invasive species.

Impacts to 16.37 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 3.24 acres of red shank chaparral would be mitigated at a ratio of 1:1 through the preservation of 26.59 acres of semi-desert and red shank chaparral and southern coast live oak riparian forest.

Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784

Cumulative Impact Analysis - There are few other projects within the immediate vicinity of the Garza and Bennett properties. The Garza TPM would result in impacts to 22.42 acres of semi-desert chaparral. Mitigation requirements (a 1:1 ratio) would be exceeded by 27.95 acres of onsite habitat preservation in an open space easement. The Bennett TPM would most likely result in impacts to 16.37 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 3.24 acres of red shank chaparral. Mitigation requirements (a 1:1 ratio) would be exceeded by 26.59 acres of onsite habitat preservation in an open space easement. The eastern portion of the Garza onsite open space easement would be contiguous with the eastern portion of the Bennett onsite open space easement.

Powell TPM 20798, a potential future project, is located in the immediate vicinity to the south of the Garza site. This project would most likely result in impacts to 9.17 acres of semi-desert chaparral and 15.55 acres of red shank chaparral. Proposed mitigation includes 11.43 acres of habitat conserved onsite and 8.77 acres acquired offsite. Therefore, the total acres of chaparral impacted would be 24.72; the total acres of chaparral proposed to be mitigated would be 20.20. To meet the required 1:1 mitigation ratio, the project would have to acquire an additional 4.52 acres of chaparral. The Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784 projects intend to apply their excess open space acreage to the Powell TPM 20798 project. The additional open space they would be able to contribute that would not be used as mitigation for their own direct impacts amounts to 4.83 acres of chaparral habitat. This amount meets that which the Powell TPM 20798 needs to acquire (4.52 acres) and exceeds it by 0.31 acres. Therefore, with the application of excess acreage from the Garza and Bennett projects, all three TPM projects would fully meet the mitigation requirements for habitat impacts. Finally, an additional 6.06 acres of Southern coast live oak riparian forest would also be placed in an RPO wetland and buffer open space easement (however, this acreage can not be counted towards overall mitigation).

Due to their adjacency and to better determine cumulative impacts to sensitive plant species, a combined biological analysis was completed for Bennett TPM 20784, Garza TPM 20777, and Powell TPM 20798. The desert beauty population which occurs on the three project sites totals approximately 2225 individuals. Presumably the population also extends to the other undeveloped lands within the project vicinity. The three projects would cumulatively impact 25% of the desert beauty population on the three sites. However, the population probably is not limited to the three project sites and the impacts likely represent a smaller impact to the population.

The Ralph project (TPM 20252) located approximately ½ mile to the north was approved in September 1999. This project preserved approximately 3.7 acres of woodland and chaparral (of the 48.1 acre site) within onsite open space. Potential cumulative impacts resulting from the three adjacent TPMs and the Ralph project would be fully mitigated and the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

The mitigation ratio for habitat loss applied to these projects is meant to compensate for the direct as well as cumulative loss of habitat. Therefore, for the reasons stated above

including onsite biological open space design and preservation, fencing and signage, limited building zone easement, and mitigation ratios for this and other projects in the area, the proposal would not result in substantial adverse effects on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service.

As detailed in response a) above, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Fish and Game Code, and Endangered Species Act are considered less than significant through the implementation of the following conditions: onsite biological open space design and preservation, fencing and signage, and limited building zone easements.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Based on a site visit conducted by County staff biologist Megan Hamilton on November 6, 2003 and a Biological Resources Report dated July 2005 prepared by Robin Church, it has been determined that wetlands, defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act are on both Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784 properties. However, the project would not impact through, discharging into, directly removing, filling, or hydrologically interrupting, any federally protected wetlands supported on the project site. The project proposes complete avoidance through establishment of open space easements. Also, a 180 foot buffer is provided by the current design where existing improvements, the road and the well, do not preclude it. Therefore, with these mitigation measures included, impacts to wetlands or waters of the U.S. that are regulated under the Army Corps of Engineers would be less than significant.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Both Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784 are surrounded by undeveloped land interspersed with rural residential uses. A jurisdictional drainage runs offsite and along the extreme northeastern portion of the Garza property and the eastern portion of the Bennett property. This drainage and the associated coast live oak riparian forest would be protected within proposed open space easements.

For the Garza property, potential future development of single-family homes would be clustered towards the northern property boundary. The southern and eastern portion of the site would be protected within an easement and separated from the development by a 115 ft limited building zone easement and fencing and signage. The eastern portion of the easement would be contiguous with the Bennett TPM 20784 open space easement and also native habitat offsite to the east. Thus, mammals (of all sizes), reptiles and birds should be able to continue to move through the site in an east-west direction along the southern portion of the property. More importantly wildlife would be able to continue to move in a north-south direction along the existing drainage (eastern portion of site) that provides topographic relief and vegetative cover. The cover provided by the tall-statured chaparral species and the drainage located onsite may provide use of the site as a native wildlife nursery site. The placement of the open space easement and its proximity to adjacent undeveloped land and to a riparian forest to the north would still allow use of the site by wildlife species.

For the Bennett property, potential future development of single-family homes would be located west of the drainage. The northern and eastern portion of the site would be protected within an easement and separated from development by a 115 ft limited building zone easement and fencing and signage. The eastern portion of the easement would be contiguous with the Garza TPM 20777 open space easement and also native habitat offsite to the east. Thus, mammals (of all sizes), reptiles and birds should be able to continue to move through the site in an east-west direction along the northern portion of the property. More importantly wildlife would be able to continue to move in a north-south direction along the existing drainage (eastern portion of site) that provides topographic relief and vegetative cover. The cover provided by the tall-statured chaparral species and the species associated with the drainage and Southern coast live oak riparian forest located onsite may provide use of the site as a native wildlife nursery site. The placement of the open space easement to include the riparian forest and the easement's proximity to adjacent undeveloped land will still allow this use of the site by wildlife species.

Therefore, with the incorporation of open space easements as mitigation, the potential impacts to wildlife movement and nursery sites would be reduced to a level below significant.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat

conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: While the proposed project (Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784) and off-site improvements are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program, the project site and locations of any off-site improvements do not contain habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required. In addition, the proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not required.

Even though wetlands and/or wetland buffer areas have been identified on the project, the project has been found to be consistent with Sections 86.604(a) and (b) of the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), due to the following reasons: a) the project would not place any non-permitted uses within wetlands; b) the project would not allow grading, filling, construction, or placement of structures within identified wetlands; and c) the project would not allow any non-permitted uses within wetland buffer areas.

The project site contains a wetland as defined by the RPO, which if disturbed would result in a significant impact. The entire area of the RPO wetland including a 50 ft wetland buffer would be placed in an open space easement prior to approval of grading permits or construction permits, or on the Parcel Map, whichever comes first. The existing well within the RPO buffer would continue to be used. There would be no net loss of wetlands and therefore no significant impact would occur.

Finally, no sensitive habitat lands were identified on the project site as determined on a site visit conducted by County staff biologist Megan Hamilton on November 6, 2003. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project would be in compliance with Sections 86.604(g) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Therefore, impacts to sensitive natural communities as identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations are considered less than significant through the off-site habitat purchase.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and surveys of the property by a County of San Diego qualified archaeologist, Andrew R. Pignuolo, RPA with Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc. on May 12, 31 and September 3, 2003, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within either Garza TPM 20777 or Bennett TPM 20784. The results of the survey are provided in the cultural resources reports titled, "*Cultural Resource Survey of the Bennett TPM Project, Boulevard, San Diego County, California*", and "*Cultural Resource Survey of the Garza TPM Project, Boulevard, San Diego County, California*", each prepared by Andrew R. Pignuolo with Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc., and dated December 2004.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Archaeological resources exist on the Garza TPM 20777 and Bennett TPM 20784 sites. Resources on the Bennett TPM 20784 site include two prehistoric sites CA-SDI-16828 and CA-SDI-16829 and five isolated artifacts (P-37-025368 thru P-37-025372). Resources on the Garza TPM 20777 site include one archaeological site (CA-SDI-16830) and one isolated artifact. The isolated artifacts are not eligible for the California Register or considered significant under CEQA or the County Resource Protection Ordinance. All three archaeological sites would be preserved within dedicated biological open space easements that would include permanent fencing and signage. The easements would be shown on each project's Final Parcel Map. Moreover, because the significant archaeological resources would be avoided and completely protected, the project would not contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact to archaeological resources.

However, due to the proximity of significant prehistoric sites and because the area to be developed consists mostly of undisturbed native vegetation, there is the possibility that

buried archaeological resources occur on the project site that could be impacted by development. Therefore, the project would implement a grading monitoring program, consisting of a County-approved archaeologist and Native American observer to mitigate potential impacts to buried archaeological resources to a level below significant.

Finally, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of Native American Tribes whose ancestral lands may be impacted by the project. The tribes listed by the NAHC were received January 13, 2005 and letters requesting tribal consultation were sent out February 3, 2005. Tribes contacted did not respond.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Unique Paleontological Resources - A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any impacts to unique paleontological resources.

Unique Geologic Features – The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. Additionally, based on a site visit by Gail Wright on March 29, 2007 no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any impacts to unique geologic features.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego by County qualified archaeologist, Andrew R. Pignuolo with Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc., it has been determined that the Garza TPM 20777

project would not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, "*Cultural Resource Survey of the Garza TPM Project, boulevard, San Diego County, California*", prepared by Andrew R. Pignuolo with Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc. and dated December 2003..

The Bennett TPM 20784 site was also surveyed by Pignuolo, RPA, on May 12, 31 and September 3, 2003, and it was determined that there are archaeological resources present that could contain interred human remains. These resources include two prehistoric sites CA-SDI-16828 and CA-SDI-16829 and five isolated artifacts (P-37-025368 thru P-37-025372). However, no impacts would occur to these sites as they would be avoided and protected by incorporation into a biological open space easement. The isolated artifacts are not eligible for the California Register or considered significant under CEQA or County Resource Protection Ordinance. An archaeological extended study was prepared titled, "*Cultural Resource Survey of the Bennett TPM Project, Boulevard, San Diego County, California*", prepared by Andrew R. Pignuolo with Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc., dated December 2004. No human remains were discovered during the course of this survey. Therefore, impacts to interred human remains are not anticipated on the Bennett TPM 20784 project site.

Finally, as outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d), in the event that human remains are discovered during grading or construction of either Garza TPM 20777 or Bennett TPM 20784, the County will work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there would be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, any future residential development associated with the project would be required to conform to the Seismic Requirements outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code would ensure that any future development associated with the proposed TPMs would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the geologic environment of the project site is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there would be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils the project site are identified as LaE3 (*La Posta Loamy Coarse Sand*), KcC (*Kitchen Creek Loamy Coarse Sand*), and MvC (*Mottsville Loamy Coarse Sand*), which have a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project would not result in unprotected erodible soils; would not alter existing drainage patterns; would avoid impacts to wetlands or significant drainage features through establishment of open space easements; and would not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared two Stormwater Management Plans (dated September 25, 2003 for Garza TPM 20777 and October 30, 2003 for Bennett TPM 20784).

The plans include the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: silt fencing, stockpile management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, and paving and grinding operations.

- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Stormwater Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project includes two TPMs that would result in 8 developable parcels. The potential future development of a maximum eight single-family residences would result in site disturbance and grading of an anticipated 3,500 cubic yards of cut and fill. However, the proposed project is consistent with the geological formations underlying the site. The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. On a site visit conducted by County staff on August 23, 2004, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are LaE3 (*La Posta Loamy Coarse Sand*), KcC (*Kitchen Creek Loamy Coarse Sand*), and MvC (*Mottsville Loamy Coarse Sand*). These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the project would not create a substantial risk to life or property. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project site includes two existing septic systems that serve the existing single-family residences. In addition, the proposed TPMs include 8 proposed standard septic systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on August 7, 2007. Therefore, it has been determined that the proposed project site has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the San

Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. Therefore, the impacts resulting from the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are less than significant.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project would not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: The State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface, or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

- i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

- ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan would not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element would not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan would not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan would not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project would comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards would occur during the Tentative Parcel Map and/or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated June 19, 2006, have been received from the Alpine Fire Protection District. The conditions from the Alpine Fire Protection District include: on-site roadways to have a minimum improved width of 24

feet with a concrete or AC surface, dead-end roadway shall terminate in a hammerhead approved by the Alpine Fire District, access roadway gradient shall not exceed 20 percent, and the minimum radius bend for roadways shall be 30 feet at the curb line (includes driveways). The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be three minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is five minutes. The projects have been redesigned to provide secondary fire access. The secondary access route would traverse through proposed parcel 4 of TPM 20798 in a north-south direction from the cul-de-sac to Vista del Cielo to provide an additional point of ingress and egress for emergency operations and/or evacuations.

The proposed secondary access shall be graded a minimum twenty feet (20') wide and improved a minimum sixteen feet (16') wide with all-weather surfacing, with a maximum grade of 20%, to the satisfaction of the Fire Authority Having Jurisdiction. A 30-foot fuel modification zone shall be required along either side of the driving surface. The proposed secondary access would also be required to be posted with the same name as the primary access road (cul-de-sac north to Shasta Way) and a sign meeting County DPW Design Standard DS-13 installed at it's intersection with Vista del Cielo.

The addition of secondary access to allow for emergency operations and/or evacuations as depicted on TPM 20798 as proposed would satisfy Title 14 CCR and the County Fire Code. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A and through compliance with the Alpine Fire Protection District's conditions, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are also required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff on July 5, 2007, none of these uses are found on adjacent properties.

Therefore, the project would not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project includes two TPMs that would result in 8 developable residential parcels. Two Stormwater Management Plans for Minor Projects were prepared (dated September 25, 2003 for Garza TPM 20777 and October 30, 2003 for Bennett TPM 20784), which demonstrate that the project would comply with all requirements of the San Diego Regional Water Control Board and Watershed Protection Ordinance. The project site proposes and would be required to implement the following site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff: silt fencing, stockpile management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, paving and grinding operations, permanent landscaping, and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls. These measures would enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project would not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project would conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Hill (911.84) hydrologic sub-basin within the Tijuana hydrologic unit is mapped on the project site. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, portions of this watershed are impaired. The Tijuana River is impaired for eutrophication, coliform bacteria, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen, pesticides, solids, synthetic organics, trace elements, and trash; Tijuana River Estuary is impaired for eutrophication, coliform bacteria, lead, nickel, pesticides, thallium, trash; and the Pacific Ocean at the Tijuana River mouth is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the Tijuana River watershed include: Freshwater: coliform bacteria, nutrients, trace metals, pesticides, miscellaneous toxics, low dissolved oxygen, and trash; Groundwater: total dissolved solids, nitrates, petroleum, MTBE, and solvents.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: soil disturbing activities, temporary on-site storage of construction materials including mortar mix, raw landscaping and soil stabilization materials, treated lumber, rebar, plated metal fencing materials, and trash generated from the project. However, the following site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs would be employed such that potential pollutants would be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: silt fencing, stockpile management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, paving and grinding operations, permanent landscaping, and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and stormwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that would reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to

comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed. As the proposed project would be required to implement the water quality protection measures contained in the Stormwater Management Plans, the impact would be less than significant.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Hill (911.44) hydrologic sub-basin within the Tijuana hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: Municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

Through the potential development of 8 vacant parcels created by the proposed TPMs, the following potential sources of polluted runoff could occur: construction activities, equipment/materials/product/waste storage and handling areas, and outdoor vehicle repair/washing/fueling activities. However, the following site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs would be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: silt fencing, stockpile management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, paving and grinding operations, permanent landscaping, and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls.

Finally, proposed BMPs in the project's Stormwater Management Plans (dated September 25, 2003 for Garza TPM 20777 and October 30, 2003 for Bennett TPM 20784) are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting processes that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting processes.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would obtain water from on-site groundwater wells. In accordance with a Residential Well Test conducted on July 22, 2004, adequate groundwater resources are available to serve future homes which may be constructed as a result of the proposed TPMs without interfering substantially with the production rate of nearby wells. The acreage of each proposed lot is of sufficient size to ensure a sustainable long-term groundwater supply. Therefore, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and the impact is less than significant.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project includes two TPMs that would result in the creation of 8 developable parcels. As outlined in the Stormwater Management Plans (dated September 25, 2003 for Garza TPM 20777 and October 30,

2003 for Bennett TPM 20784), the project would implement site design measures, source control, and treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff. These measures would control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent erosion from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works would ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project would not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and would not alter any drainage patterns on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation would be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI, Geology and Soils, Question b.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:: The Department of Public Works (DPW) reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), Preliminary Drainage Study, and Preliminary Grading Plan prepared by Walsh Engineering & Surveying Inc for both TPMs. The reports are complete. The proposed project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns and would not significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons:

- a. Drainage would be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- b. The project would not increase water surface elevation in a watercourse with a watershed equal to or greater one square mile by 1' or more in height.
- c. The project would not increase surface runoff exiting the project site from any watershed equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project would not substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: DPW staff reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), Preliminary Drainage Study, and Preliminary Grading Plan prepared by Walsh Engineering & Surveying Inc for both TPMs. The studies are complete. The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: construction activities, equipment/materials/product/waste storage and handling areas, and outdoor vehicle repair/washing/fueling activities. However, the following site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs would be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: silt fencing, stockpile management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, gravel bag berm, paving and grinding operations, permanent landscaping, and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: DPW staff reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), Preliminary Drainage Study, and Preliminary Grading Plan prepared by Walsh Engineering & Surveying Inc for both TPMs. The reports are complete. No housing is proposed to be placed in any FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres; therefore, no impact would occur.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: DPW staff has reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), Preliminary Drainage Study, and Preliminary Grading Plan prepared by Walsh Engineering & Surveying Inc for both TPMs. The reports are complete. No structures are proposed to be placed in any 100-year flood hazard areas; therefore, no impact would occur.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: DPW staff reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), Preliminary Drainage Study, and Preliminary Grading Plan prepared by Walsh Engineering & Surveying Inc for both TPMs. The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area that includes a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located

immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is a type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, County staff has determined that the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. Although the proposed project could result in land disturbance that would expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not introduce new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy RDA (Rural Development Area) and General Plan Land Use Designation (18) Multiple Rural Use. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 4 acres and limits density to one dwelling unit per 4 acres. As the proposed TPMs propose one dwelling unit on parcels that are at least 8 acres or greater, the proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Mountain Empire Community Plan and is consistent with that Plan. The current zone is S92, which requires a net minimum lot size of 8 acres. As each proposed parcel within the TPMs is at least 8.00 net acres, the proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is within land classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area where geologic information indicates no significant mineral deposits are present (MRZ-1). Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral

deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned S92, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes two Tentative Parcel Maps that would create a total of 8 vacant parcels each intended for the development of a single-family home. In addition, a single-family residence is located on each TPM site. Therefore, residential uses occupied by residents would be present on the project site. Based on a site visit completed by County staff on August 23, 2004, the surrounding area also supports residential uses to the north, west and south. However, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level

(CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on County staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours. Therefore, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned S92 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 45 db(A). The adjacent properties are also zoned S92 and have one-hour average sound limit of 45 db(A). Based on review by County staff, the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards because the project would not include any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.410

The project would not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. In addition, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.410) would ensure that the project would not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts. The project would not exceed the local noise standards for construction, noise sensitive areas, or noise limits at the property boundary. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: vehicles and construction activities. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project would not result in cumulative noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future projects would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient

noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Each of the proposed TPM sites contains a single-family home, which would remain. Potentially, the proposed Tentative Parcel Maps could result in the future development of eight additional single-family dwellings. The

new single-family homes would be in addition to those that currently exist on the site. Therefore, the project would not displace existing housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Each of the proposed TPM sites contains a single-family home, which would remain. Potentially, the proposed Tentative Parcel Maps could result in the future development of eight additional single-family dwellings. The new single-family homes would be in addition to those that currently exist on the site. Therefore, the project would not displace any people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms were received on November 5, 2003, which indicate existing services are available to the project from the Mountain Empire Unified School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff

facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project includes two TPMs that may result in the potential future development of 8 single-family residences. Therefore, the project would also result in an incremental increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities, the project would be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay park fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication, thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project would not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

There is an existing surplus of County Regional Parks. Currently, there is over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which far exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive surplus of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation, the project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities

or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project would not result any cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant surplus of regional recreational facilities would remain.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact : The proposed project would result in an additional 96 Average Daily Trips (ADT), which represents 48 ADT generated by Garza TPM 20777 and 48 ADT generated by Bennett TPM 20784. The project was reviewed by the County of San Diego Department of Public Works and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The adjacent roads are operating at a level of service "C" or better. Therefore, the project would not have a significant direct project impact on traffic volume, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project will result in an additional 96 ADT. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to exceed a level of service (LOS) standard at the direct project level. Therefore, the project would not have a significant direct project-level impact on the LOS standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. Cumulative impacts may not be less than significant.

However, the County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections method contained in an adopted planning document, as referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates an additional 96 ADT. These trips would be distributed on circulation element roadways in the unincorporated county that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which would be required at issuance of building permits, in

combination with other components of the program described above, would mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not significantly alter traffic safety on Tierra Del Sol or any other public road. A safe and adequate sight distance shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. Any and all road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Roads used to access the proposed project site shall be to County standards. The proposed project would not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. A Fire Protection Plan for the project was reviewed by the Department of Planning and

Land Use Fire Marshall and deemed to have adequate emergency fire access. Additionally, roads used to access the proposed project site would be improved to County standards.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required roadway improvements would be constructed to maintain existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves creating a total of 8 vacant parcels with individual septic tanks proposed for each. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control

Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on February 2, 2006. Therefore, the project has been found to be consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project would not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would include permanent landscaping and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at stormdrain outfalls to control stormwater flow and velocity. Refer to the Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects (dated September 25, 2003 for Garza TPM 20777 and October 30, 2003 for Bennett TPM 20784) for more information. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form Section I-XVII, these improvements would not result in an adverse physical effect on the environment. Specifically, refer to Section VIII for more information.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact. The project would obtain water from on-site groundwater wells. In accordance with a Residential Well Test conducted on July 22, 2004, adequate groundwater resources are available to serve future homes which may be constructed as a result of the proposed TPMs. The acreage of each proposed lot is of sufficient size to ensure a sustainable long-term groundwater supply. Therefore, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- e) Wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would rely completely on on-site wastewater systems (septic systems); therefore, the project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project would generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of Public

Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project would generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare

or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant that would be potentially impacted by the project include Biological Resources, and specifically, impacts to semi desert chaparral and red shank chaparral. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significant. This mitigation includes the establishment of an onsite open space easement. Potentially significant impacts may occur to cultural resources, and specifically, buried archaeological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significant. This mitigation includes the implementation of a grading monitoring program and the presence of a qualified Archaeologist onsite. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Ayala TPM	TPM 20740
Wylie TPM	TPM 16116
Ralphs TPM	TPM 20252
Outdoor World Retreat and RV Park	MUP Mod/Dev 81-076-03
Madsen TPM	TPM 20774

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to transportation and traffic. However, mitigation

has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significant. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF, which would be required prior to the issuance of building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to transportation and traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to below a level of significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF, which would be required prior to the issuance of building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc. Cultural Resources Survey of the Bennett TPM Project, Boulevard, San Diego County, California." September 2003.

Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc. Cultural Resources Survey of the Garza TPM Project, Boulevard, San Diego County, California." September 2003.

Peterson Environmental Services. Water Quality Testing for Uranium and Gross Alpha, Bennett Minor Subdivision TPM 20784. May 1, 2008.

Peterson Environmental Services. Water Quality Testing for Uranium and Gross Alpha, Garza Minor Subdivision TPM 20777. May 1, 2008.

RC Biological Consulting, Inc. Biological Technical Report for Bennett Minor Subdivision TPM 20784, Garza Minor Subdivision TPM 20777 and Powell Minor Subdivision TPM 20798. Revised July 2005.

RC Biological Consulting, Inc. Fire Protection Plan for Bennett Minor Subdivision TPM 20784, Garza Minor Subdivision TPM 20777 and Powell Minor Subdivision TPM 20798. April 2005.

Walsh Engineering, Inc. Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, Garza TPM 20777. September 25, 2003.

Walsh Engineering, Inc. Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, Bennett TPM 20784. October 10, 2003.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.
(www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
(www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of

the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.
(www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.
(www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning

Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.